

Remarks

All pending claims have been rejected as being obvious over Savole (6,571,051) in view of Hirano (6,180,862).

Hirano.

The rejection of all claims is based on the Examiner's assertion that Hirano "teaches that the transmitting of editing program from the server to a client is well known (Hirano, column 13, lines 53-64; column 18, lines 62-66)." Office Action, page 3.

This assertion is not correct. In fact, Hirano teaches just the opposite. Hirano teaches on-line tone editing in which the editing program resides on the server and stays on the server.

Hirano states at col. 13, lines 53-64 (one of the passages cited by the Examiner) that "the client machine 1301 ... receives the **editing screen data** from the server machine...." (emphasis added) At col. 18, lines 62-66 (the other passage cited by the Examiner), Hirano states "tone parameters ... can be edited appropriately **without installing a plurality of editing devices or editing programs in a user's machine.**" (emphasis added) Hirano's process is clearly described in the Abstract.

"The client computer itself need not be equipped with an editor, i.e., an editing program, and it can utilize a desired editor or editing program on an on-line basis via the communication network. That is, desired editing data is input to the client computer, so that the editor or editing program of the server machine is run on-line in response to the editing data input and a result of editing by the editing program is sent back to the client computer via the communication network. For example, when a desired editor is selected via the client computer, an editing screen is supplied from the server computer to the client computer, so that the client computer carries out a desired editing input operation with reference to the supplied editing screen and then the server machine executes editing processing using the selected editor and in response to the editing input and transmits a result of the editing processing to the client computer."

Applicants respectfully suggest that the rejections are based on a mistaken interpretation of Hirano and, for this reason alone, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Savoie.

The rejection of all claims is based on the Examiner's assertion that Savoie teaches the claimed server at column 1, lines 36-37, figure 3 -- column 5, lines 14-19, 23-25, 37-40 and column 8, lines 35-37. This assertion is not correct. In Savoie, edit decisions for compressed (i.e., lower definition) video images are made on the so-called "off-line" computer 102 shown in Fig. 1 of Savoie. Computer 102 is not networked to a server. Computer 102 is a stand alone computer as shown in Fig. 1 and described in the accompanying text. Computer 102 is pre-programmed with the image editing program -- there is no server programmed to transmit an image editing program to computer 102. Video images are supplied to computer 102 through a tape recorder 101 -- there is no server programmed to transmit video images to computer 102. See Savoie, column 3, lines 18-54.

There is only one possible computer/processing unit in Fig. 3 of Savoie -- presumably "processing system 301" is referring to a computer/processing unit, although any such processing unit is not specifically called out in Fig. 3. All of the other components are peripheral devices under the control of processing system 301 -- hard disc units 302, video monitor 303, audio monitors 304, display unit 305, tape recorder 306, graphics tablet 307, stylus 308 and floppy disc drive 309. There is simply no server-client relationship shown in Savoie Fig. 3. See Savoie, column 4, line 55 through column 5, line 18.

Applicants respectfully suggest that the rejections are based on a mistaken interpretation of Savoie and, for this reason alone, the rejections should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
J. Anderson et al.

By



Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

September 13, 2004